

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(oracle01.031)

PATENT

5 **Applicant:** Alok Srivastava **Confirmation No.:** 6477

Application No: 10/798,545 **Group Art Unit:** 2161

Filed: 3/11/2004 **Examiner:** Paul Kim

10 **Title:** *Method and apparatus for integrating data from external sources into a database system*

15 Commissioner for Patents

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to a non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Summary of the prosecution

20 Examiner mailed a first Office action on 9/11/2006 in the above application in which he objected to the *Abstract* as having more than 150 words and rejected all of the claims. Claims 1,3,5,7,9,11,13, 15,17,19,21,23,25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,995,961, Levy, et al., *Information manifold for query processing*, filed 11/7/96 and issued 11/30/99 (henceforth "Levy"); claims 2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,24,26, and 28 were rejected under 25 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Levy and Official Notice. Applicant amended his *Abstract* so that it is no more than 150 words long and traversed the rejections of the claims. Applicant also noted an error in the spelling of the inventor's name.

30 On 5/31/2007, Examiner mailed a second non-final Office action in the above application in which he rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over the combination of Levy with U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0059720, Rodriguez, *Broadcast network platform system*, filed September 23, 2002 (hereinafter "Rodriguez"). Applicant is traversing the rejection on the basis that under 35 U.S.C. 102, Rodriguez is not available as a reference.

35

Traversal

As set forth in the *Cross-references to related applications* section of Applicant's Specification, the present application is a divisional of U.S. patent application 09/429,839, which was filed October 29,

1999, which precedes the September 23, 2002 filing date of Rodriguez. Rodriguez is consequently not available under 35 U.S.C. 102 as a reference in the prosecution of the present patent application.

Failure of the combination of Levy and Rodriguez to show all of the limitations of Applicants'

5 *claim 1*

When Applicant's attorney called Examiner on 6/6/07 to discuss the validity of Rodriguez as a reference, Examiner indicated that what Rodriguez added to the disclosure of Levy was merely the disclosure of a "streaming data item server". In order to guide Examiner's search and speed up prosecution of this application, Applicant's attorney would like to remind Examiner that as 10 pointed out at page 5, lines 14-20 of Applicant's response filed 12/8/2006, there were *two* fundamental distinctions between Levy and the invention of claim 1:

Because Levy's system does not establish a direct connection from any of its 15 information sources to user interface 101 and does not disclose an information source that provides streaming data, it cannot and does not disclose claim 1's step of

providing the first identifier and a second identifier *to the streaming data item server*, the second identifier identifying the client and the first identifier and *the second identifier being usable by the streaming data item server to establish the connection*.

20

As far as Applicant's attorney can determine from a quick perusal of Rodriguez, the search engine of Rodriguez, like Levy's uniform query interface, does not provide a "second identifier to the streaming data item server" which identifies the client and which "the streaming data item server [can use to] establish the connection [via a network for a streaming data item between a 25 client for the streaming data item and a streaming data item server for the streaming data item]. Consequently, even if Rodriguez were a valid reference, the combination of Rodriguez with Levy would not show all of the limitations of Applicant's claim 1.

Conclusion

30 Applicant has traversed the rejection by demonstrating that Rodriguez is not available as reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 and has thereby been completely responsive to Examiner's Office action of 5/32/2007. Applicant has thus satisfied the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111(b) and respectfully requests that Examiner continue with his examination as provided by 37 C.F.R. 111(a). No additional fees are believed to be required for this response; should any be, please 35 charge them to deposit account number 501315.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gordon E. Nelson/

Attorney of record,

Gordon E. Nelson

57 Central St., P.O. Box 782

Rowley, MA, 01969,

Registration number 30,093

Voice: (978) 948-7632

Fax: (866) 723-0359

6/5/2007

Date

5

10